UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,823	02/12/2001	Sharad Mathur	13768.190	8558

47973 7590 07/01/2005

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
VO, HUYEN X	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2655	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/781,823	MATHUR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Huyen X Vo	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *2/12/2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant has submitted an amendment filed 4/29/2005, amending claims 1 and 11-12, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the amended limitation (*see claim amendment*). Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by claim amendment in view of Mase et al. (US 5978820).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 10 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: the use of the word "identifying" in line 1 of claim 10 lacks antecedent basis. Examiner has amended the word "identifying" to "differentiating". The word "the first" in line 3 of claim 10 is improper. Examiner has amended "the first" to "a first". The word "the second" in line 7 of claim 10 is improper. Examiner has amended "the second" to "a second". The word "lenient that" in line 8 of claim 10 is improper. Examiner has amended "lenient that" to "lenient than". The same errors exist in claim 13. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 11-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mase et al. (US 5978820).

5. Regarding claims 1, 11-12, and 14, Mase et al. discloses that in a computer system having access to a text message and a computer readable medium that contains a plurality of semantic components that may include, for example, one or more headers or a message body, a method for compressing the text message on a per semantic component basis to form a compressed message while maintaining a degree of human readability, the method comprising the following: an act of accessing the text message (*element 105 in figure 3*); an act of parsing the text message into the plurality of semantic components (*col. 6, lines 30-50 and/or col. 11, lines 1-50*); and for at least some of the plurality of semantic components, performing the following: an act of differentiating between each of the parsed semantic components and selecting a compression method, if any, to be used for each semantic component when compressing the semantic component for inclusion in the compressed message, taking into consideration the specific attributes of each semantic component in selecting a compression method appropriate for each semantic component (*col. 12, line 61 to col. 14, line 67*); an act of including the compressed semantic component in the compressed message (*element 110 in figure 3*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mase et al. (US 5978820).

8. Regarding claims 2-9, Mase et al. fails to specifically disclose a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the semantic component comprises a header field, a current message within a body of the text message, and an embedded message within the text message, and wherein the text message comprises an e-mail message, a task message, a meeting request message, a meeting reminder message, and a meeting summary message. However, Mase et al. does teach a text reduction/compression system used to process any text messages (*col. 5, lines 10-25*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to readily realize that the teaching of Mase et al. can be used to reduce/compress any text messages mentioned above. The advantage of this is to enable the system of Mase et al. to reduce/compress/summarize text messages for the user.

9. Claims 10 and 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mase et al. (US 5978820) in view of Grefenstette (US 6289304), as applied to claims 1 and 12, respectively, and further in view of Chen et al. (US 5850476).

10. Regarding claims 10 and 13, Mase et al. the act of differentiating a compression method comprises the following: an act of determining a first character length of the text message if it was compressed using a first set of compression rules; an act of determining that the first character length is within a size limit for the compressed message; an act of determining a second character length of the text message if it was compressed using a second set of compression rules that are more lenient than the first set of compression rules; an act of determining that the second character length is not within the size limit for the compressed message; and an act of using a third set of compression rules that are at least as strict as the first set of compression rules, but ~~more~~ more lenient than the second set of compression rules, to compress the text message.

However, Grefenstette discloses a method and a computer readable medium in accordance with claims 1 and 12, wherein the act of identifying a compression method comprises the following: an act of using a third set of compression rules that are at least as strict as the first set of compression rules, but more lenient than the second set of compression rules, to compress the text message (*col. 9, lines 43-67 or figure 7 shows 8 different levels of text reduction, wherein each level reduces a different amount of text*).

Since Mase et al. and Grefenstette are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Mase et al. by incorporating the teaching of Grefenstette in order to generate an efficient text summary.

The modified Mase et al. still fail to disclose an act of determining the first character length of the text message if it was compressed using a first set of compression rules; an act of determining that the first character length is within a size limit for the compressed message; an act of determining the second character length of the text message if it was compressed using a second set of compression rules that are more lenient that the first set of compression rules; an act of determining that the second character length is not within the size limit for the compressed message.

However, Chen et al. teach an act of determining the first character length of the text message if it was compressed using a first set of compression rules; an act of determining that the first character length is within a size limit for the compressed message; an act of determining the second character length of the text message if it was compressed using a second set of compression rules that are more lenient that the first set of compression rules; an act of determining that the second character length is not within the size limit for the compressed message (*the operation of figure 11, if the message is a short message, a first compression is used, otherwise use a second compression, wherein each of the two compression methods uses a different set of compression rules*).

Since Mase et al. and Chen et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Mase et al. by incorporating the teaching of Chen et al. in order to generate a short summary of the text message while retaining the meaning of the original text message.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Below is a list of prior art references that are considered pertinent to the claimed invention:

Kaplan (US 5721939)

Fein et al. (US 5924108)

Bogaraev et al. (US 6185592)

Fleischer (US 5960383)

Anward et al. (US 6658377)

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HXV

6/28/2005

***

SUSAN MCFADDEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER